



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Biblical Notes.

Historical Difficulties in Stephen's Address. Three of these have recently been discussed by Dr. Samuel Hutchings in the N. Y. *Evangelist*. The explanations offered are these: (1) When Stephen speaks (Acts 7: 14) of seventy-five persons going down into Egypt with Jacob, whereas the Old Testament says there were only seventy (Gen. 46: 27; Ex. 1: 5; Deut. 6: 22), he is manifestly following the Septuagint, and the Septuagint perhaps varies thus from the Hebrew because the translators numbered among the posterity of Jacob the five sons of Ephraim and Manasseh (1 Chron. 7: 14), who were omitted by Moses because born after Jacob's departure. (2) The common idea that Stephen makes Jacob (Acts 7: 15) to have been buried in Shechem, thus disputing Gen. 50: 31, is incorrect. A proper reading of the Greek makes Stephen refer only to the sons of Jacob, and he does not speak of the place of Jacob's interment. (3) Stephen states (Acts 7: 16) that Abraham bought a burial place in Shechem of the sons of Emmor, while Gen. 23: 9 says he bought a burial place of Ephron the Hittite. That Abraham bought Macphelah in Hebron of Ephron there is no doubt. Did he purchase one in Hebron and one also in Shechem? This is only a conjecture, but worthy of consideration. Or, it may be a copyist's error in Acts 7: 16, inserting Abraham's name instead of Jacob's. Or, perhaps Stephen used no name where Jacob's would be understood, and the copyist erroneously put the wrong one in.

The Form of Jesus' Teaching. A recent reviewer of *Wendt's Teaching of Jesus* thus presents the author's thought on this point: "It is an element in the peculiar greatness of Jesus that he is free from studied effort to exhibit originality in his teaching; that he takes his place, with the full consciousness of doing so, in the connection of historical development, and puts forth the revelation of which he was aware that he was the organ, not as standing in contrast to, but as carrying onward and completing, the earlier divine revelation which was the glory of the people Israel." "The outward form of his teaching was not esoteric or scholastic, nor elaborated into scientific or systematic shape, but called forth by incidental occasions and moulded by practical needs; not sought as an object in itself or for its own sake, but solely as a vehicle for the truth which it disclosed; and standing in striking contrast to the prolix casuistic subtleties of the scribes by its unique combination of two characteristics: the utmost clearness so as to be understood of the people, and the utmost condensation of meaning—popular intelligibility and the most impressive pregnancy." "As to the conceptions of natural phenomena, of human life, of earlier history, and particularly as to the agency of angels good or bad, which are found associated with the teaching of Jesus, they were simply taken up and employed according to the current popular acceptance. He did not seek to make them the objects of independent investigation, to purify or to enrich them, or by adopting them to give to them the sanction of reve-

lation ; but used them as they were popularly understood, and desired to concentrate his own and his hearers' attention wholly on what was the true object of his teaching—the gospel of the Kingdom of God.”

Roman Reckoning of the Day. Upon this subject Profs. Dods and Sanday have had some little argument. Prof. Dods maintains that the Romans reckoned the day from sunrise to sunset, which would make noon the sixth hour. This he supports from the ancient Roman sun-dials, on which noon was marked VI ; and by the epigram of Martial (4:8) concerning the routine of the Roman day. He argues that this method of reckoning may fitly be called Roman, as opposed to the modern custom of reckoning from midnight, and because that which was Roman was likely to be “almost universal” at that time. Prof. Sanday objects to calling this method of reckoning “Roman,” first, because it was used by many other peoples as well ; second, because the Romans had another peculiar and exceptional method of reckoning from midnight, confined to certain legal and technical purposes, which should fitly be termed “Roman” rather than the other, if the designation is to be used.

The Messianic Consciousness of Jesus. Prof. Dickson thus presents the view of this taken by Dr. Wendt in his recent important work : “Wendt has no sympathy with the view that accounts for this reserve either by a gradual growth of the Messianic consciousness after the ministry began, or by a tentative process of laying claim to the character ; on the contrary, it was ever since the baptism a matter of personal experience and an undoubted certainty.” “He had early learned from his own experience what the true nature of the kingdom was, had set an example whereby others might learn how to realize it, and he had in this consciousness the sure basis of the certainty that he was the Messiah. Though he only avowed it towards the close, he was conscious of it from the baptism at the Jordan ; and it was the consciousness of his personal communion with God that assured him of his ability and vocation to undertake his Messianic work for others.” “This open avowal of his Messiahship was repressed, partly to obviate the risk of its being misconstrued by the prevalent expectations of the Jews, but mainly that he might first pave the way for its recognition in the right sense and on the true grounds by instruction as to the nature and aims of the kingdom. The Messiah was to be a means to an end ; though in reality the means precedes the end to which it ministers, in the matter of recognition the understanding of the end must precede the understanding of the means whereby it is appropriately to be attained.”

Preaching to the Spirits in Prison. Is there a passage in the Bible more alluring to exegetes than this one (1 Pet. 3:18–22)? A writer in the *Homiletic Review* is the latest to discuss its meaning. Three criteria are established for the interpretation of the text : (1) it must conform to the exact language of the passage ; (2) also to the manifest teachings of plain portions of the same writing ; (3) also to the line of thought in the preceding and succeeding contexts. He finds this line of thought, which runs through the disputed text, to be Peter's exhortation to the Christians to live righteous lives, even at the cost of suffering therefor, as Christ had set them the example (vs. 18). The